



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/258,123	02/26/1999	ROBERT T. BURGER	107227.00102	3397

27557 7590 11/25/2002

BLANK ROME COMISKY & MCCAULEY, LLP  
900 17TH STREET, N.W., SUITE 1000  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

ROBINSON, GRETA LEE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2177

DATE MAILED: 11/25/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/258,123

Applicant(s)

BURGER ET AL.

Examiner

Greta L. Robinson

Art Unit

2177

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. Glen Forbis (reg. no. 40,610).

(3) Greta Robinson.

(2) Mr. Steven Thiel.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 22 November 2002.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 40.

Identification of prior art discussed: Mitchell et al. US Patent 5,963,966; Barrett et al. US Patent 4,918,588.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed the limitation of the print queue and it's ability to convert data into viewable files. Applicant stated that Barrett et al teaches a conventional print queue noting column 11 of the reference. A formal response will be filed and an amendment to further distinguish the novel aspect of the invention over the prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
GRETA ROBINSON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required